DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 039 HE 028 159

AUTHOR Ostheimer, John
TITLE Linking Evaluation and Reward Systems to Improvements in Teaching and Learning: A Case Study.
PUB DATE Nov 94
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Conference of the Center for Educational Development and Assessment on Current Collegiate Faculty Evaluation Practices and Procedures (San Juan, PR, November 8-10, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; College Faculty; *College Instruction; Educational Quality; *Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Professional Recognition; Program Development; Program Implementation; *Rewards; Teacher Improvement; Teacher Participation; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS *East Tennessee State University

ABSTRACT

In response to re-accreditation recommendations, East Tennessee State University is devising and implementing a plan to use faculty evaluations for the improvement of faculty and the educational program. A task force developing the plan has outlined three major projects: (1) establish baseline data on current status of faculty development efforts and resources particularly as related to quality of teaching and learning, by finding measures of teaching quality, finding measures of quality of learning, and assessing current evaluation of instruction; (2) make indirect improvements in teaching and learning by ensuring maximum faculty commitment and participation, by promoting collegial approaches to improving instruction, assessing current recognition programs, suggesting opportunities to recognize improvements in instructional quality, linking successful efforts to improve teaching to the structure of rewards in professional advancement, linking success in instruction to financial rewards through merit raises, and linking individual faculty plans and efforts to departmental plans; and (3) make direct improvements in teaching and learning through both short term steps and longer range plans. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 381 039

LINKING EVALUATION AND REWARD SYSTEMS TO IMPROVEMENTS IN TEACHING AND LEARNING:

A CASE STUDY

John Ostheimer
East Tennessee State University

HE 028 159

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Ostheimer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LINKING EVALUATION AND REWARD SYSTEMS TO IMPROVEMENTS IN TEACHING AND LEARNING:

A CASE STUDY

John Ostheimer
East Tennessee State University

INTRODUCTION

East Tennessee State University, a regional comprehensive university of about 12,000 students, hosted a re-accreditation visit by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) in 1993. The visiting team was generally impressed by the University and its programs, and ETSU was reaccredited for another ten years. Nevertheless, a number of issues were identified by the university in its Self-Study and received attention by the SACS team during their review. Some of these concerns resulted in "Recommendations" in the final report by SACS. The campus has been busy addressing these concerns since the SACS visit.

On-going campus-wide discussions hold promise for substantially improving the quality of instruction and enhancing student learning outcomes. ETSU's experience in tackling the entire gamut of instruction-related issues could be of interest to other institutions of higher education. Teams of faculty, students, and administrators are reexamining every aspect of the multi-faceted relationships between student preparation and incentives, faculty motivation and capabilities, faculty development, and student learning outcomes. The SACS review team made 31 recommendations. Of that total, 17 dealt with educational programs and with the faculty. Two of those recommendations have been isolated as having extraordinary potential for profound improvements in the quality of ETSU's undergraduate education. SACS declared that ETSU should:

- Provide components designed to ensure competence in reading, writing, student core competencies, oral communication, and mathematical skills. (Rec #7)

- Demonstrate that the results of faculty evaluations are used for the improvement of the faculty and the educational program. (Rec #21)

Upon receipt of the SACS review report, representatives of the administration were joined by the Faculty Senate's committee on faculty development to devise a comprehensive plan for responding to SACS Recommendation #21. A "final report" was dispatched to SACS in October, 1994. Even during the brief interlude between the SACS site visit and the report responding to the Recommendations, much had been accomplished. Nevertheless, the comprehensive nature of these projects will require efforts and activities that will engage the campus well in the future.

BACKGROUND ON THE UNIVERSITY

One needs some understanding of East Tennessee State University's development over the past two decades to fully comprehend the nature of what has happened since the 1990's began, and to

appreciate the substantial changes going on now. Having grown from origins in 1911 as a normal school, "East Tennessee State College" became "ETSU" in 1963, reflecting the same revolution of access that turned other regional institutions into comprehensive universities. The faculty grew quickly, arriving with "good" (research-oriented) doctorates from major universities in the Southeast and further afield. The administration did not change as quickly, retaining more regional roots and perspectives. Tensions grew between faculty trained as scholars, and administrators who wanted the prestige of the degrees faculty brought with them, but retained a regional orientation and believed that teaching was the major function of the campus. Close-vested and centralized administration coexisted uneasily with growing professional specialization and departmentalization in the academic units.

During the late 1970s, a brief presidency changed the model radically, beginning a belated but open recognition of the importance of research and initiating the reform of administrative patterns. The period of 1983-91 reinforced those changes with a vengeance. Under a president with a business\medical administration background, an emphasis was placed on building strong professional programs, particularly in health, technology, and business. This was solidly reinforced by Tennessee's pioneering "Performance Funding" system, which placed unusual importance on program accreditation. Research received encouragement to the point that most faculty fully believed only research accomplishments would be rewarded.

As that presidency ended, the campus went through an uneasy period that gave way to a new stability around the time of the SACS reaccreditation visit. Two brief interim presidencies oversaw the opening up of administrative and financial practices to public view. The faculty, whose senate had been growing in confidence and capability since the late 1980s, began to feel more involved.

Roughly at the same time, national concerns with undergraduate instruction and learning, developing since the early 1980s, finally found openings at ETSU. Frustration over inability to revise the General Education system motivated some faculty. Desire to establish the primacy of teaching motivated others. A third large block, somewhat overlapping with the first two, was the faculty of Arts and Sciences. Long frustrated by the effects of emphasizing professional programs, they saw an opportunity to reestablish balance of priorities.

The SACS reaccreditation Self-study and site visit were key events among the forces that have come together to make the 1990s the decade when ETSU turns to teaching as a "legitimate" pursuit. Accreditation visits are opportunities for institutions to be candid about their strengths and weaknesses. If a university has enough confidence to take the self-study seriously, and to avoid viewing the event as a public relations exercise, much can be accomplished. Indeed, ETSU's self-study may be one of the more candid on record. SACS wrote in their evaluation of the self-study:

> *The committee believes that the university might have been more generous to itself in listing institutional strengths. The university is in many respects stronger than the self-study indicates.*

The second interim president became "permanent" in mid-1993, and a new academic VP arrived in January, 1994. This individual had been Academic Vice-Chancellor of the Tennessee Board of Regents system for many years, and the first of the two interim presidents in 1991-2. He knew ETSU well, and he hit the ground running. His predilections toward addressing the core of the undergraduate education fit well with the theme of the new president's administration to make ETSU the "university of choice" for this region. Emphases on retention/graduation rates, recruitment, and

quality teaching and learning are evident. A few of the more productive researchers now comment about a turn away from scholarship, but most faculty welcome the effort to revive concern for teaching and understand that teaching and scholarship go together.

This is the exciting climate surrounding the web of developments described below. The key to involving the faculty is to be found in (and between) the lines of Recommendation #21. From the first meeting of the Task Force that was put together to frame a response to that recommendation, it was clear that the issues involved were central to improving teaching and learning on the campus.

THE TASK FORCE'S REPORT

The Task Force organized topics related to the SACS Recommendation 21 into three major projects:

I. Establish baseline data on current status of faculty development efforts and resources, particularly as related to quality of teaching and learning.

   A. Find measures of quality of teaching.
   B. Find measures of quality of learning.
   C. Assess current evaluation of instruction.

II. Make indirect improvements in teaching and learning by ensuring maximum faculty commitment and participation.

   A. Promote collegial approaches to improving instruction.
   B. Assess current recognition programs and suggest opportunities to recognize improvements in instructional quality.
   C. Link successful efforts to improve teaching to structure of rewards in professional advancement through evaluation, tenure, and promotion.
   D. Link success in instruction to financial rewards through merit raises when available.
   E. Link individual faculty plans and efforts to departmental plans.

III. Make direct improvements in teaching and learning.

   A. Take short term steps.
   B. Make longer range plans and begin implementation.

I.

Establish baseline data on current status of faculty development needs, particularly as related to quality of teaching and learning.

A. **Find measures of quality of teaching.**

At the present time two principal measures of the quality of teaching are being used regularly at ETSU. These are (1) the Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) and (2) peer observations by faculty and department chairs in those departments where such techniques are used.

A third potential tool is the periodic survey of faculty attitudes about teaching.* The faculty senate surveyed faculty attitudes towards teaching and learning in Spring 1994. Ongoing assessment and refinement of a questionnaire are recommended. If this instrument was developed to a level that could provide accurate faculty assessments, it could serve as a source of baseline data to measure the faculty's perceptions of improvements in teaching and learning.

1. The only institution-wide assessment tool is the Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI)*, which has been given in at least two of each professor's classes each semester beginning about a decade ago. A revised form was adopted for Fall 1992. The SAI has two parts. The first portion includes forced response questions about the course and instructor, and the second section asks for open-ended responses. Results of the first portion are used as part of the faculty member's annual evaluation plan and are part of the tenure or promotion portfolio. In the past, no consistent use was made of the open-ended student responses unless the faculty member used them to improve course planning. Beginning with the new form, however, department chairs read the comments before they are returned to each professor. The comments sections are also available for use by the deans.

There is evidence from the most recent survey of the faculty that some faculty (76% of respondents) are dissatisfied with aspects of the SAI. Many other faculty members feel that the SAI should not be the primary form of faculty evaluation. They believe that the results measure things other than quality of teaching (such as a student's grade or the popularity of the teacher,) and that the questions are confusing and inappropriate. No doubt, some faculty believe all of the above problems with the SAI are true.

Analysis of grouped SAI data and validity checks were being undertaken by the Office of Institutional Research to determine if the instrument provides useful information on the quality of teaching as well as confirmation of the instrument's validity. Perhaps then, the faculty's level of confidence in the SAI form will increase.

2. The second major technique currently being used to evaluate the quality of instruction consists of observation of faculty members by their department chairs, or (less often) by faculty colleagues as part of the FAP/FAR/FAE (Faculty Activity Plan/Report/Evaluation*) process. In some departments, chairs only visit the classes of tenure-track faculty. Deans are charged with review of chairs' teaching. Discussion is going on about other forms of review of chairs' instruction. There is currently considerable variability as to both the frequency of utilization and as to how feedback is integrated into the faculty evaluation process. There are no institutional guidelines.

B. **Find measures of quality of learning.**

1. Since the SACS reaffirmation visit, efforts have increased to locate measures of student learning outcomes. A study of results on General Education was published in February, 1994.* The results were not reassuring. Two measures were available at that time. ETSU had administered five years of ACT-COMP to graduating seniors (1987-92), and one year of the COLLEGE BASE exit exam (1992-93) as part of Tennessee Performance Funding. To quote from the report: "ETSU's seniors . . . scored worse on the ACT-COMP than most of the eight comparison institutions (provided by ACT)." The results on COLLEGE BASE are no better.

Also, there are several exit exams required by various professional programs at ETSU; among these exams are the National Teacher Exam, the National Nursing Exam, and others. An effort is underway to locate all such indicators, and to compile as complete as possible a picture of student learning from these results.

While students are motivated to take professional licensing exams, it is possible that the General Education test results will not provide an accurate measure of student learning because of the attitude students have about taking the exams. Testing center officials do report that students' attitudes toward COLLEGE BASE are much more positive than for ACT-COMP. Potential erosion of that positive student attitude because of C-BASE's math emphasis is being discussed, however, along with a program to offer tutoring for students who wish to increase their confidence level for the test by brushing up on basic math skills. In short, every practical effort should be made to improve student attitude toward the tests and to maximize their efforts to do well.

2. The faculty survey indicates that, while the faculty who responded (about 26%) felt that the quality of teaching was high or average at ETSU, they also felt that the quality of learning was average or poor. Many complained of poor students and low expectations set for students. The University is committed to improving student retention, but a faculty attitude that the quality of students is weak can act as an attitudinal barrier which will impede faculty commitment to retention efforts. Therefore, it is recommended that some steps be taken to help improve the faculty perception of the students and to help faculty set higher expectations for their students. Part of the problem may be that faculty do not really know much about today's students' problems, expectations, and anxieties. Faculty development efforts should make such information available.

3. Potential sources of funds are being identified for developing a comprehensive general education outcomes assessment plan, i.e. Performance Funding Office.

C. **Assess current evaluation of instruction.**

1. Identify underlying assumptions: individual and/or collegial responsibilities.

It is recommended that a more standard evaluation policy for teaching and learning be developed campus-wide. Included in this discussion should be exploration of the collegial role of faculty as mentors or peer coaches. Additionally, it is the responsibility of each faculty member to demonstrate adequate self-evaluation through the development of teaching portfolios which include examples of teaching methods, evaluation methods, course syllabi, etc.

2. Review specific evaluation policies, procedures, and forms.

a. Many of the complaints about the SAI could be addressed if steps were taken to improve the administration of the instrument. Therefore it is recommended that the following action be taken:

(i) Standardize administration procedures by developing a script to be used each time the SAI is given. (This was reviewed, and a new script is ready for Fall, 1994).*

(ii) Promote a more positive climate for administration of the SAI to help faculty and students take the procedure more seriously. Students should be encouraged to think of improving instruction as the object of the exercise. Two ways to increase student understanding of the purposes of the SAI are to develop effective, standard wording for the instruction script that includes the purposes, and to include a session on faculty evaluation in the Freshman Orientation Courses that are being developed. Also, beginning with Summer 1994 Orientations, the importance of the SAI was discussed with new students. Finally, an agreement with the Faculty Senate will result in an annual article in East Tennessean on the faculty evaluation process, emphasizing the students' role.

b. Additions were made to the Spring, 1994 Faculty Activities Evaluation Form* with the intention of allowing faculty and department chair to make specific recommendations for improving instruction based on the SAI and other forms of course evaluation. Because of timing problems with the production of FAE forms, implementation was imperfect. These problems are currently being addressed for Spring 1995.

3. Assess current evaluation's strengths and weaknesses.

a. It is recommended that the current SAI be reevaluated. This analysis will help to determine if this particular instrument is really the one the faculty is most comfortable with. A validity test will be added to the SAI in the Fall of 1995 which should add more data with which to assess the usefulness of the SAI. Grouped data analyses will be provided. Statistical presentation will be improved by concentrating on Mean scores allowing comparisons within faculty rank, course level, department, and college.* In addition, analysis of key nominal categories will be simplified. Finally, trends over time will be available.

b. Take steps to improve the use of the results of the SAI:

(i) Provide the faculty with more specific guidelines to interpret the statistical results of the SAI and then apply those results to instructional improvement.

(ii) Make the printout of SAI results more "user friendly" by clarifying labels; standardizing scores, using descriptive statistics where appropriate, and including interpretive keys.

(iii) Develop a mechanism to report the narrative portion of the SAI during the FAP/FAR/FAE process.

4. Look for new sources of evaluation data.

a. New approaches will be developed to help faculty use other methods to assess and improve instruction. A handbook for faculty and/or workshops on assessment and improvement of instruction, and a Center for Improvement of Teaching and Learning are being discussed.

b. An emphasis is being placed on developing other forms of evaluation of instruction, including, but not limited to the following, each of which will be the topic of a faculty workshop or conference:

(i) Peer review.
(ii) Portfolio development.
(iii) Self-evaluation using videos and other means.
(iv) Periodic in-class student feedback.

5. Revise the university's approach to outcomes assessment. Currently, the Office of Outcomes Assessment (OOA) functions as a reporting arm for the state's "performance funding" process. OOA needs to engage in full-range outcomes assessment with linkages to academic processes such as curriculum, to the Senate's Faculty Development Committee, and to budgetary implications.

6. Identify constituencies for good teaching at ETSU. For example, alumni may have concerns because of what they as graduates perceive to be weaknesses in their education. Employers may see weaknesses in ETSU graduates.

a. Collect information from alumni regarding strengths and weaknesses in instruction. The current alumni questionnaire* is already deemed to be "too long" so questions will have to be redesigned for assessment effectiveness'.

b. Collect information from employers, field work supervisors, and others who deal directly with ETSU students and alumni. Current assessment of the university's employer constituencies are haphazard. They need to be made more systematic and to subsequently provide information that feeds back in practical ways to concerned departments.

7. Integrate into evaluation and faculty development processes the work of the 1992-93 ad hoc committee on faculty who are no longer performing at levels consistent with current institutional mission.*

II.

Make indirect improvements in teaching and learning by ensuring maximum faculty commitment and participation.

A. **Promote collegial approaches to improving instruction.**

Professors cannot possibly keep their findings "private" if they are to succeed with research or creative work. No less is true in teaching. Nevertheless, teaching is approached by most professors in a remarkably private way. Teamwork and collegial efforts to improve instruction and enhance student learning require knowing what colleagues are doing in their classrooms.

On the other hand, while ETSU must strive to make the teaching enterprise less private, increasing the openness of teaching activities must be accomplished within the boundaries of respect for academic freedom. That freedom is still a key cornerstone of higher education. Nevertheless, academic freedom should not be used as a screen to protect privacy that serves to hinder instructional improvement.

With these constraints in mind, ETSU will make an effort to "open up" the subject of teaching by changing the campus culture toward one of cooperation and teamwork. Outside lecturers will be brought in to challenge the dominance of privacy that exists on this, as on most campuses. Workshops and roundtable discussions will be held to compare experiences and encourage mutual efforts. Video conferences will be provided so that faculty will be able to become more familiar with teaching innovations on other campuses.

To facilitate collegial efforts at the unit level, each department will be asked to define its own mission and its specific statement of purposes related to its instructional program. Further, departmental faculty, who are currently expected to state individual goals as part of the (FAP), will be asked in Spring 1995 to show how those goals are related to the department's purpose. Each department's needs for faculty should be built on the mission and purposes of the department. Following from this, departments should search for new or replacement faculty who can truly work in a cooperative manner. These efforts to recruit collegial faculty are mandated, in effect, by Section 2.2.7.1 of the Faculty Handbook Tenure Policy.* One of the criteria for considering tenure is "Demonstrated willingness and ability to work effectively with colleagues to support the mission of the institution and the common goals both of the institution and of the academic organizational unit."

B. **Assess current recognition programs and suggest opportunities to recognize improvements in teaching quality.**

ETSU has recently developed a program of faculty teaching awards to recognize outstanding accomplishment. A campus award recognizing the Outstanding Teacher was presented for the first time in August, 1994. Previously, awards existed to recognize research, and generally outstanding performance, but not teaching per se.

In addition, teaching awards have been created at the college level. All of these newly-created awards will be funded by the ETSU Foundation beginning with August, 1994. Also, the Student Government Association presented two Outstanding Teacher awards for the first time in 1994.

Other approaches toward recognizing teaching excellence are being studied and implemented as appropriate. Recipients of Instructional Development Grants* are reporting on their projects in written form, and in faculty fora. The Faculty/Staff campus newsletter, Accent*, has agreed to insert a feature on teaching improvements and innovations. The new college teaching awardees were invited to address a university-wide faculty conference to share the "keys to instructional success." Other possibilities being investigated include assigning graduate assistants to allow more faculty time, and earmarking resources to further improve teaching and to serve as examples for colleagues.

C. **Link successful efforts to improve teaching to structure of rewards in professional advancement through evaluation, tenure, and promotion.**

The entire relationship between faculty expectations and instructional quality must be clarified, beginning with the university's official documents on evaluation, tenure, and promotion. These Faculty Handbook sections will be re-examined for consistency of their messages related to instruction. Criteria that define "good teaching" must be made as clear as possible at the campus level. Descriptive terms used for categories of teaching performance currently vary from document to document, and will be modified to create a more uniform picture: faculty should be able to draw direct parallels between their annual performance evaluation and their progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

Part of this review will involve reconsideration of the six current evaluation categories (EXCEPTIONAL, MERITORIOUS, COMMENDABLE, SATISFACTORY, MARGINAL, UNSATISFACTORY). Six categories are too many when most faculty are described as MERITORIOUS, when "COMMENDABLE" means improvement is needed, and when the lowest three categories are often ignored.

Drawing on the appropriate Faculty Handbook sections, colleges and departments will create more specific statements of criteria of good teaching that relate to their fields. All units have been asked to complete such statements by October 1, 1994. Statements created before January, 1992 must be reconsidered, with desirable revisions completed, by October 1, 1994. The purpose of efforts to create or improve these documents is to make it clear to faculty in the most specific terms possible what colleagues expect in relationship to teaching, as well as research/creative work and service.

D. **Link success in teaching to financial rewards through merit raises when available.**

Administrators will take into account all data collected at each level of the evaluation process in determining merit raise amounts whenever such salary funding is available. Faculty who are identified as successful teachers will be presented by their department chairs and deans for merit-based equity increments whenever that flexibility is available in state funding.

Eligibility for "equity" raise, when such raises are possible, will be carefully considered for their impact on morale. Faculty who are not performing with merit, particularly as teachers, should not benefit from equity raises at the expense of most of their colleagues who are competent teachers. Further, merit raises should not go to productive scholars in this comprehensive university setting unless they are also competent teachers.

The academic deans have resolved that salary reviews based on merit/equity assumptions ought to take place at least every three years.

E. **Link individual faculty plans and efforts to departmental plans.**

Departments should openly discuss the relationship between individual faculty activity plans and departmental goals. In addition, departments could encourage individual and group energy through a group reward system tied to Performance Funding. The Assessment Advisory Council has recommended that part of the performance funding "earnings" of the campus be shared with departments who have had successful program reviews. A contradictory view is that resources do already return to reviewed departments through the regular budget process. This discussion should result either in change or in more faculty seeing real connections between program review and new resources.

III.

Make direct improvements in teaching and learning.

A two part approach can be used to improve both teaching and learning on our campus. Short term plans are underway for Academic Year 1994-95, some of which require funding. Longer range planning should lead to a campus Teaching and Learning Center.

A. **Take short term steps.**

Beginning with the 1994-95 academic year, several critical areas are being addressed through funding in the 1994-95 budget:

1. Funding for Instructional Improvement Grants should be raised to the same level as is available for the Research Development Grants. Special efforts should be made to encourage grants which address such areas as assessment of student learning, effectiveness of various teaching methodologies, and utilization of new technology and media in the university's instructional programs. A three-year plan would be realistic for achieving parity with the RDC grants, at $33,000 per year. The first budget increase has occurred.

2. Additional funds, $20,000, should be budgeted to increase the holdings of Sherrod Library. Of particular need are books, journals, and various media which support professional development as well as research into teaching and learning. A three-year plan to reach the $20,000 level began with 1994-95, funded at $7,333 per year. A reading room has been identified in Sherrod Library, and a collection of books and journals is being assembled.

3. At least $10,000 annually should be budgeted for faculty workshops which support faculty development. At least one workshop per semester would be funded. These workshops would focus on areas such as assessing student learning, developing both faculty and student portfolios, methods of incorporating newer teaching technologies into the classroom setting, and similar areas related to teaching and learning.

4. During the 1994-95 year, funds have been provided to hire a faculty development consultant for the purpose of campus visits, identification of resources, and a definitive report which would lead to the establishment of a Teaching and Learning Center.

5. Funds should be budgeted annually for instructional equipment, support, and services. A valid goal is one multi-media equipped classroom per department throughout the campus within three years. These multi-media classrooms would be equipped similarly to the new lecture halls in Rogers-Stout, Warf-Pickel, and other buildings on campus. (These renovated and reequipped classrooms were on-line for Fall, 1994.) With the university's new focus on shared use of facilities, the increase in number and size of multi-media classrooms should enable an even greater number of faculty across disciplines to incorporate the use of new technologies into their teaching strategies. In addition to the increased number of multi-media classrooms, there should be a larger pool of instructional equipment available across the campus. Basic support and service from the university would ensure that equipment is kept in good repair and placed in advance in those classrooms for which professors had requested its use. One of the tasks of the faculty development consultant (above) will be to help prioritize instructional/classroom technology needs, leading to a multi-year plan* that would be prepared by May, 1995.

6. By Fall semester 1994, Mathematics and Writing laboratories were in place. The Writing lab, budgeted at $80,975 for 1994-95, will provide tutoring for students and assistance for instructors, particularly those who will be teaching the Writing-Intensive Courses in the proposed revision of General Education.* The Math lab, funded for $55,350, will provide tutoring as well as the first phase of a self-paced testing approach for basic required courses.

Several projects which focus on teaching and learning could be started at little or no cost to the University. These would include the identification of available resources, the implementation of systems of peer review and mentoring, the establishment of a Professional Development Council, a formal period for the annual sharing of research and strategies on teaching and learning, and a campus wide Renaissance Day to meet vendors and assess equipment.

B. **Make longer range plans and begin implementation.**

Two new Chairs of Excellence have been created within the past year. Both will have a strong impact on instruction. The first is in the College of Education.* The person holding this new Chair of Excellence will play a key role in faculty development activities. First, this individual could lead in the identification of faculty development resources. There are numerous resources already on the campus; there needs to be a means to better disseminate this information. In addition, the holder of this Chair of Excellence should visit or communicate with other Faculty Development Centers to help formulate our future plans. Lastly, the university needs to be aware of professional organizations, journals, seminars, etc. expressly devoted to Faculty Development and to utilize what these have to offer.

The second new chair, established for "The Integration of the Arts, Rhetoric, and Sciences",* will bring important teacher/scholars to ETSU as the core of an effort to bridge the sciences, technological fields, and the liberal arts. Its impact will be to assist faculty to develop curricular connections between fields, thus addressing the over-specialization that dominates American higher education.

Faculty seem ready to take advantage of the opportunity to open up discussion about teaching. A significant number of those responding to the recent faculty survey expressed a willingness to have colleagues visit or observe in their classrooms as well as a similar feeling that they would benefit from visiting in a colleague's classroom. A smaller number of faculty expressed support for having an actual system of peer evaluation or review. The holder of the Chair of Excellence in Education should participate in planning for peer review. This plan should cover instruction or workshops for faculty to learn how to do peer evaluation, a mechanism for providing feedback to those having the evaluation, and a means for having peer review become a part of the total evaluative package at ETSU.

The mentoring of junior faculty members by selected, more senior faculty could promote faculty development. Numerous comments in the recent faculty survey indicated the need to learn more about how to teach, awareness of available resources, evaluation of students, and course development. A one-to-one, mentoring approach could help junior faculty grow in these areas.

By both necessity and design, part-time teachers and graduate assistants also have an impact on students at ETSU. During 1994, a new Handbook for Part-time Faculty* was distributed to all departments.

Also, graduate student orientation was reexamined and improved during the August convocation week.

In a campus as diverse as ETSU, a single plan cannot address the needs and interests of all of our faculty. Each college should establish a Faculty Development Committee whose charge would be to identify faculty, instructional, and student needs related to teaching and learning which are specific to that college and to identify means within that college to meet those needs. To facilitate information sharing among all faculty, a University Faculty Development Committee, composed of two representatives from each college, should be established. One of these should be the chair of each college's faculty development committee. Input from the university level committee also could assist in the requests for additional holdings for Sherrod Libraries and in the overall technology upgrading of the university.

An additional means for the sharing of information and strategies would be facilitated by having a time (such as a Faculty Senate meeting) devoted to research activities related to teaching and learning. Recipients of Instructional Development Grants would have an additional forum through which to share their work. The first such event took place at a faculty senate meeting during Spring, 1994. A periodic Instructional Research Report should be sent to all faculty to apprise them of developments.

An annual Renaissance Day should be held during which a wide variety of educational technology vendors would visit the campus. This would provide a means for a larger number of faculty to see new equipment, consider its applications within individual disciples, and negotiate for site testing or use of equipment on loan.

Various efforts must be integrated into one coherent plan for improvement of quality in teaching and learning. The Task Force charged with responding to this SACS recommendation has created a model of interrelationships which will be handed over to the most appropriate campus committee for continued development and implementation as an organizing model.

In order to capture the momentum that began with the SACS review of 1992, efforts to improve teaching and learning at East Tennessee State University will eventually be focused by a Center for Teaching and Learning. Long term planning will begin with recommendations of consultants, the first of which will visit campus during Spring, 1995. Subsequently, a center will be established with a mission to strengthen instruction as well as stimulate and disseminate research on teaching and learning. Such a center must be developed and directed by and for the faculty, integrate existing structures and resources as well as provide leadership and continued momentum. Members of the aforementioned college Faculty Development committees and University Professional Development committee could, logically, comprise a Board of Directors. This center would combine our heritage as a teachers' college with our contemporary roles in research and service. Both faculty and students will be the ultimate beneficiaries.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS PROVIDED TO SACS **(indicated by *)**

Reference on page

4: "Results of the ETSU Faculty Survey"
4: "Student Assessment of Instruction" (form)
4: "Annual Evaluation of Faculty" - Faculty Activity Plan/Report/Evaluation (FAP/FAR/FAE)
5: "General Education: A Report on the Status of General Education at East Tennessee State University"
6: Revised script for SAI administration -"Directions for Monitor"
6: Revised FAE form
6: Sample of statistical report for SAI
7: Alumni questionnaire
7: "Evaluation and Development Proposal for Tenured Faculty"
8: Tenure policy statement
9: "Instructional Development Grants" - policy statement
9: Issue of Accent
11: Plan for renovating lecture halls with instructional technology
11: Chair of Excellence - College of Education
11: Chair of Excellence - College of Arts and Sciences
12: "Part-time Faculty Handbook"

John Ostheimer is Dean of Arts and Sciences at East Tennessee State University. He wrote the Introduction and Background sections. The SACS report was written by a faculty/administration Task Force which he chaired.